

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Disparalona* Fryer, 1968 (Crustacea, Branchiopoda)

(Case 2990; see BZN 54: 89–91)

Mark J. Grygier

Lake Biwa Museum, 1091 Oroshima, Kusatsu, Shiga 525-0001, Japan

I oppose Fryer's proposal to set aside priority and conserve the chydorid water flea generic name *Disparalona* Fryer, 1968. This name is threatened by the recent discovery of the true nature of the problematical *Phrixura rectirostris* Müller, 1867, *Phrixura* Müller, 1867 being the senior generic synonym. However, *Disparalona* appears to be a name important to only a few taxonomic specialists who can easily keep track of a change. Fryer presents no evidence that this problem is of any wider urgency for other biologists or ecologists (such as a threat to the name *Daphnia* would engender, for instance). Although, as Fryer notes, the senior name was based on a deformed specimen and is morphologically inappropriate, this is no cause for rejecting it (Articles 18 and 23m of the Code).

Fryer's citation (para. 7 of the application) of Article 23b is hardly applicable because *Disparalona* is not 'long-established', having been proposed only 30 years ago. In my view Fryer has failed to present convincing reasons for upsetting priority in this case.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Papilio sylvanus* Esper, [1777] (currently *Ochlodes venata* or *Augiades sylvanus*; Insecta, Lepidoptera)
(Case 3046; see BZN 54: 231–235)

P. Sigbert Wagener

Hemdener Weg 19, D-46399 Bocholt, Germany

I can well understand that Dr Devyatkin has found nomenclatural problems in the course of his work on the *Ochlodes venata*-group of Palaearctic butterflies. My colleagues and I were not happy with using the name *venata* in our book on the butterflies of Turkey (Hesselbarth, van Ooorschot & Wagener, 1995, pp. 177–178) and I think that the proposal put forward by Dr Devyatkin, to use the name *sylvanus* Esper, [1777], is the best solution to the problem of a name for the Large Skipper.

Following Dr Devyatkin's finding that *O. venata* (Bremer & Grey, 1853) and *O. sylvanus* (Esper, [1777]) represent distinct species (paras. 6 and 7 of the application), I support the proposed conservation of the name *sylvanus* for the taxon recently, but possibly incorrectly, known as *O. venata faunus* (Turati, 1905).

In relation to para. 2, I should like to point out that pl. 36 in Esper's work, which includes the figure of *Papilio sylvanus* and from which the name is available (Article 12b(7) of the Code), was published in 1777, and the corresponding description in 1779 (see Heppner, 1981), and that the text of *Augiades sylvanus* by Mabille (in Seitz, vol. 1, pp. 1–347) was published in 1909 (not 1906).